

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,789	06/29/2001	Marcos Nogueira Novaes	YOR920010315US1	4577
48150 . 75	90 09/01/2005		EXAMINER	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC			LY, ANH	
	JRTHOUSE ROAD		<u> </u>	
SUITE 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
VIENNA, VA	22182-3817		2162	
		•	DATE MAN ED 00/01/200	_

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<u> </u>					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/893,789	NOVAES, MARCOS NOGUEIRA				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Anh Ly	2162	; •			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 15 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		=				
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</li> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ol>						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no						
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		RST REPLY WAS FILE	סאו אואווא כ			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comof filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be seen filed.</li> </ol>	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because						
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ul>		⊓E below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		educina or simplifvina	the issues for			
appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li> </ul>		timely filed amondm	ont concoling			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:		rill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-17, 22, 23-39, 44-45 \$47-55. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a (1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.			ince because:			
<ul><li>12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s).				
JEAN M. CORRIELLIS						
		PRIMARY EXAN	MINER			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicants' argued that, "in Egger, the number "n", ... from the number of "textual objects" ..., and not from the number of "subject" of the 'textual objects." and Eggers clearly fails to teach or suggest ... "constructing a N-dimensional corodinate space, where N is a cardinality of the collection of subject words." (Page 14, the 5th and 6th paragraph).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., number of textual objects ... not from the number of subjects of the textual objects) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Egger teaches n-dimensional vector space and generating a coefficient of similarity (col. 16, lines 20-25 and col. 37,48-65). Egger teaches building a system with n-dimensional vector space for representing data, which is collecting of subject words, in a database or a network for searching/retrieving (col. 5, lines 38-55 and abstract), and providing a user interface with two or three dimensional spatial orientation of data (abstract, col. 16, lines 12-35, col. 17, lines 38-48). The subject words include words, phrases, terms, keywords, paragraphs or portions (col. 13, lines 50-67 and col. 14, lines 1-8; also col. 5, lines 38-55).